allowed. Claims 56 and 57 objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but were indicated to be allowable if rewritten in independent form. Similarly, claim 60 was indicated to be allowable if rewritten to overcome the 35 U.S.C. 112 second paragraph rejection and in independent form. The Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review objected to the drawings. Each of the items raised by the Official Action is addressed below in the order raised.

Claims 49, 58 and 59 have been amended to be more clear and distinct. Claims 37-60 are presently pending with claims 37-48 standing allowed.

# 35 U.S.C. 112 Second Paragraph Rejection (Claims 49-52 and 58-60)

The rejection of claims 49-52 has been addressed by amending claim 49 as directed by the Official Action. Claim 58 has been amended to recite "a small footprint suitable for use in an arcade environment" as described at page 5, lines 6-9 and page 25, line 2 et seq., for example. Claim 59 has been amended in the same way that claim 33 of the parent patent, U.S. Patent No. 5,739,457, was amended. Claim 60 depends from claim 59.

## Obviousness-Type Double Patenting (Claims 49-55, 58 and 59)

A terminal disclaimer is submitted herewith thereby overcoming this rejection.

# Objected To Claims

These claims are now allowable with their allowable parent claims.

### Formal Drawings

Formal drawings are being prepared and will be submitted before issue.

# Conclusion

All of the presently pending claims, as amended, appearing to be allowable, withdrawal of the present rejection and prompt allowance are requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Peter H. Priest

Reg. No. 30,210

Law Offices of Peter H. Priest

529 Dogwood Drive

Chapel Hill, NC 27516

(919) 942-1434